

# DAILY OPINION SUMMARY

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

This summary now appears 2 or 3 times a week, instead of daily.

No. 4708

January 23, 1962

PS FILE COPY -- DO NOT REMOVE

1. Angola
2. Punta del Este Conference

### 1. ANGOLA

Comment on Portuguese Angola was sharply divided, as debate began in the UN General Assembly with a resolution by Poland and Bulgaria demanding sanctions and an arms embargo against Portugal.

An end to Lisbon's "intransigence" is demanded by some. "Somehow Angola, and Mozambique, will achieve independence," says the New York Times. "It will be better for them, as well as for Portugal, if the Lisbon Government helps in the process" (similarly, Kansas City Times, Milwaukee Journal, Ralph McGill).

Walter Lippmann holds that the U. S. attitude toward Portugal cannot be "the same as our attitude toward the enlightened nations of Western Europe," for Salazar's colonial policy is a "menace to the public peace."

The Chicago News declares Portugal's argument that the Angola dispute is wholly domestic "is a feeble defense at best"; yet, "cut loose now, Angola would almost certainly be another Congo," the News fears.

Several deplore the U.S. "failure strongly to support our old ally." "Despite the assistance given us during the war, and its unflinching loyalty later," Constantine Brown complains, "Portugal is very low on the Washington totem pole." With the "little help" she has had from the U.S. and Britain on Goa and Angola, adds the Dallas News, it is "no wonder" reports have appeared that Lisbon "may turn to the left in her foreign policy, even to the extent of recognizing Red China."

To Hearst's New York Journal-American, the Afro Asian "field day denouncing Portugal for holding onto Angola," in contrast to their behavior regarding Goa's seizure, "is a prime example of the double standard which threatens the future of the UN." The Chicago Tribune points to the "hypocrisy" of "two such fine specimens of freedom and independence as communist Poland and Bulgaria" demanding sanctions against the Portuguese retention of Angola.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 2 -

2. PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE

Opinion continues divided as to whether adoption of sanctions is necessary for Conference success, as the OAS Council meets.

"Rhetoric is not enough," some declare. To the Washington Star, "mere condemnatory rhetoric is not the sort of thing that is likely to have much influence on the thick-skinned Fidel Castro." Citing the OAS Peace Committee's "detailed report," the Star calls for political and economic sanctions.

"The conference might well end in a stalemate," says the New York Times. "A pious declaration condemning Communist intervention in the hemisphere and the obvious lack of 'representative democracy' in Cuba would leave the situation unchanged."

Approving Secretary Rusk's linkage of action against Castro with the Alliance for Progress, Scripps-Howard's Washington News declares: "Somehow Dean Rusk must convince men like [Brazilian Foreign Minister] Dantas (whose country has been loaned more money than all the rest of South America combined) that the bottom of the barrel is in sight....If an insufficient number of governments are interested, there is no reason for the U.S. to invest collectively in their future."

But some others would see a "substantial interim achievement" in a near-unanimous declaration recognizing the Communist threat (Balt. Sun). Agreeing that Congress may well make the extent of U.S. participation in the Alliance program dependent on a "powerful anti-Castro stand," the Sun thinks this possibility may not be efficacious with Latin Americans who believe that U.S. "concern for them might diminish if Castro were altogether de-activated."

"Joint condemnation is surely the minimum possibility" for OAS action, says the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and it "would signify more than mere words; it would amount to a blunt invitation to Cuba to withdraw from the inter-American system and would tend to put Cuba in solitary confinement."

"A near-unanimous vote indicting Castro for flagrant violation of human rights and for subordinating his country to a totalitarian foreign power would have more effect," the Washington Post maintains, "than a narrowly-passed sanctions measure that would split the OAS without felling Castro."

Regretting the reluctance of the larger nations to favor sanctions, the Los Angeles Times observes: "This may not make much sense north of the Rio Grande, but in the OAS the votes lie south."

OFFICIAL USE ONLY